



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Tremont Temple Meetings.

The series of Monday noon meetings announced to be held in Tremont Temple, Boston, under the auspices of the Massachusetts Good Citizenship Society, to promote public interest in the coming International Peace Conference at The Hague, was opened on the 6th of March, one thousand people being present. Mr. Edwin D. Mead presided, and opened the exercises by a short statement of the supreme importance, in the history of the world, of the Conference called by the Czar of Russia, and the duty of America to be behind no other nation in the effort to promote the success of the Conference. Mr. Mead was supported on the platform by Hon. Robert Treat Paine, President of the American Peace Society, Dr. Lyman Abbott of Brooklyn, and a number of other persons interested in the movement. Edward Everett Hale, who, because of his long advocacy of a permanent international tribunal, had been chosen as the most fitting person to open the series of meetings, was introduced and spoke as follows:

DR. HALE'S ADDRESS.

I should like to begin by telling a little story. I was, about six weeks ago, in a large audience of college professors and their friends, speaking on this very subject. A gentleman on the other side of the hall arose and said, "Will Dr. Hale tell us why every century has been more warlike than the century before, if there is a possibility of permanent peace?" That was meant to be what is called a "sticker". I replied, "Because it is *not so*." I counted on my fingers the eight years and one hundred days in which the people of America had been engaged in war in the nineteenth century, and compared them with the thirty-six years they were engaged in war in the century before. We have cut down thirty-six years of war to eight years. What we propose now is to subtract twenty-eight from the eight years that are left! (Laughter and applause.) That is what we are here for. We have come to apply to the world the eternal principles which in our own country we have applied for the last one hundred and ten years.

Now I am going to read my text. My text is the Czar's rescript, and I read it from *The Peace Crusade*, the journal of this movement, as printed this morning. I have met, I suppose, in the last fifty days twenty or thirty thousand people to whom I have spoken about the Czar's rescript. I wish I thought there were one thousand who could repeat five consecutive words of it; I wish half had seen it; I have discussed it with many who never heard a word of it. It was originally written in the French language and badly translated into English, in which translation it is in everybody's hands. In this number of *The Peace Crusade* there is as correct a translation as can be conveniently given.

Nicholas II., the Czar of Russia, directed his minister of foreign affairs to present to all the representatives of foreign nations in St. Petersburg the following communication. The press, for some reason unknown to me, always chooses to call it the "disarmament proclamation", but its opening words are "the maintenance of general peace". The Czar uses as a convenient illustration "disarmament", but you will see that the maintenance of general peace and the establishment of perpetual peace

are the object of this great rescript. (*See the rescript above.*)

I pity the man who can read that paper either to a public assembly or in his own closet and then turn around and say: "The Czar lies; he is in a bad scrape and wants to get out of it." I pity the man who is in the habit of taking such a view of the motives of other men. Whether you believe in the Czar or not, whether you believe in this statement by the man whose business it is to know what has been done in the last twenty years—the result of twenty years of diplomacy—or whether you choose to say, judging from your own heart, "He is a liar", *he has pulled the string!* The door will open and this conference will come together for the purpose he has proposed—for the purpose of considering the maintenance of general peace; and, thank God, no power this side of God can stop it! Twenty-six men or possibly fifty-two men, from twenty-six civilized and Christian nations will meet in that hall in The Hague in Holland next May, for the first time in history since Jesus Christ died, that his dying prayer may be so far fulfilled, "That they may be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they may be one in us." It will be the first time in nineteen centuries that any body of men authorized by anybody who has had power has met to consider the conditions of perpetual peace.

We are here to-day representing every form of opinion, people who have worked in all sorts of ranks in the past, because, as Americans, we know it is possible to keep together forty-five nations and live without war, and we mean to teach that lesson to Europe and to mankind.

I have here (I am not going into details) abstracts of fifteen out of twenty treaties to which the Czar has referred. I have, more definitely, several specific plans which have been brought forward in the same line; for instance, the great plan of Mr. Blaine, which was agreed to by representatives of sixteen of the American states. I have the great plan of the Inter-parliamentary Conference of Brussels. That was rather a curious congress. Any person who is a member of our Congress, of the Parliament of Great Britain, or of any other parliamentary body, may meet in the inter-parliamentary conference, in Brussels or elsewhere, every summer, and in a meeting of three or four hundred important representative men. This conference drew up a very interesting plan for a permanent tribunal. Similar plans have come into many of the treaties, as the Czar has said, but I will not undertake to name them in detail. These twenty-six men are coming together to consider this subject to which Mr. Mead has referred as the better organization of the world.

It is an absurd thing to say, but the truth is, there is a certain difficulty in speaking on this subject in America, because we all know how to do this thing. We have known since we were schoolboys. We have forty-five states, proud, independent, sovereign, each one taking care of its own affairs and resenting all interference from outside; yet these forty-five states live in constant peace. The men who made the Federal Constitution had to deal with thirteen starving little states down on the Atlantic seaboard, quarreling with each other; New York establishing a tariff against Connecticut, and so on. Every load of wood carried across the frontier was the cause of a quarrel. And this body of men meeting to form the

Federal Constitution made an arrangement which for one hundred and ten years has kept the states at peace with each other. The Civil War is not an exception, for the Civil war was based upon a question which from cowardice they omitted from the Constitution. For the rest, those thirteen states, and the states that have been added have lived in peace. Have there been no questions between them? Hundreds of questions. I am speaking to an unusually intelligent audience, but it would be no disgrace to any person not to know what was the subject at issue between Massachusetts and Rhode Island sixty years ago, yet such a subject has convulsed the states of Italy and Germany in war again and again. We had a boundary question of considerable importance, involving large annual taxation. Why did n't we quarrel about it; why did n't we fight about it, as Bulgari and Moldavia would if their lines came together? Because there was a permanent tribunal which heard the question and decided; and there never was a percussion cap snapped or a bullet cast in war.

I was coming up through Iowa three years ago this spring with one of the most intelligent gentlemen I know, a judge of the Superior Court of Iowa. We crossed an immense river there, and I said: "Judge, is that the Des Moines river you were going to fight about?" The judge said: "Well—it was, or it was not—I really don't know. I cross the river four times each year, and of course I ought to know; the next time you come along I will know." There was the river, and the army of Iowa on one side in force, and the army of Missouri in force on the other side, and nothing wanting but the imprudent word of a deputy sheriff to have had a thousand men killed on each side; but the deputy sheriff did n't speak. How was the question adjusted? A permanent tribunal existed to which Iowa and Missouri had to refer. The permanent tribunal made the decision, and Iowa and Missouri were at peace and have forgotten they were at war. And one of the most intelligent men of Iowa could not tell where the river was, about which the controversy had arisen! That is just as possible between the states of Europe as between the states of America.

There is an important passage in Bryce's "American Commonwealth." Bryce understands that here are forty-five independent nations that have made a covenant and agreed together to submit questions to a permanent tribunal. He says that, so far as he knows the literature of continental Europe, there is but one book which seems to show that the author understood the condition of affairs here—a book written by a Swiss schoolmaster. That one man in continental Europe should have ascertained that such a thing is practicable shows that it is possible for America to teach the nations of the world that they can be as independent as they choose at home; they can flog criminals if they wish; they can have public schools or not, and have as many million men in their armies as they want, and nobody shall interfere; but, at the same time, they may have a permanent tribunal which shall decide between them when there comes a question of boundary or trade. We know that for two hundred years after the period which might be roughly marked by the death of St. Paul, after Christianity had introduced itself into Rome, the states of Europe lived in peace. So when I meet my Philistine friend on State street and he says: "Well, you know, of course, you have to have

war once in thirty years, to let off the bad blood and get rid of idlers; you know you have to have war," I say, "*I don't know any such thing!*" I know that for two hundred years western Europe lived in peace. We would not have been in this room but for the two hundred years of peace in the reigns of the Antonines. Western Europe might have been as barbarous as North Dakota was twenty-five years ago.

After Henry IV., the first sovereign in Europe for four hundred years, had made France into one country he conceived the idea of a permanent tribunal for all Europe. This plan he called the "Great Design"; he made Sully agree to it, and Sully was the first statesman of Europe in five centuries. They sent it across to Queen Elizabeth, she saw and approved the plan, and Burleigh and Cecil and the rest of them saw it and agreed to it. With those two strongest powers on its side, thirteen out of fourteen of the states of Europe agreed to the permanent tribunal; and we should have had it three centuries ago; but while Henry was marching at the head of the allied forces to crush out the only recalcitrant he was struck by the dagger of Ravallac, and the heart that beat for the peace of Europe ceased to beat. I never heard anybody say that Burleigh was an ass, that Sully was a fool, or that Henry IV. did n't know what he was talking about. Yet if I had been speaking here a year ago, and I had ventured to say that the great man who is at the head of the strongest empire in the world would, before the end of August, call a conference for the purpose of organizing a permanent tribunal for establishing peace, I should have been called a dreamer, a poet, a crank, or a fool. But *he has spoken it*; the door is open; and men are going in.

It is very interesting, as one traces the progress of history, to see who have been and are the supporters of this great movement. You have had William Ellery Channing, Immanuel Kant, William Penn. You have Henri Quatre to make a plan for you; but when it is to be worked out you do a little as you do when you want to buy a house lot; you go down on State street and consult a lawyer to make sure how the title is and how the thing is to be done. As Mr. Depew said in an admirable speech in favor of an international tribunal between England and America, recollect that it is to the great lawyers of England and America you owe constitutional liberty. Constitutional liberty is not such an old thing. It is not in the Pentateuch, not in the Twelve Tables, and not in Justinian. Constitutional liberty came in when Coke and the lawyers around him told Charles I. that higher than the divine right of kings is the divine right of law. Law is the first daughter of the voice of God! That is the lesson the lawyers taught then; and the lawyers of this country, true to that great lesson, gave us the constitution of 1787. It is the great Bar Association of the state of New York that has drawn the most definite and most practical of a dozen plans which will be laid before the convention at The Hague.

It is easy to talk about poets; it is easy to sneer at Mr. Tennyson and the prophet Isaiah, and say the lion may lay down with the lamb, with the lamb inside, and to make other stale jests; but it is not so easy to sneer when *the great lawyers of America have drawn up a plan which the great lawyers of England have approved.*

The Olney-Pauncefote treaty—a treaty which will

always be remembered gratefully in the history of this movement—failed in the United States by the vote of a few senators who did not represent one-tenth of the people of the country. This treaty had its defects, and its failure is no reason for the failure of all the schemes. These plans will now be brought before a competent jury of twenty-six men, or possibly fifty-two men, statesmen, men of affairs, lawyers, diplomatists. That is the great encouragement for us to-day; these plans will be brought together; something will come of it. I do not see more than five merchants in this room—I do not see that number. The rest are cutting off coupons in the security vaults, or they are sending instructions for making gold in Australia or silver in the mountains. But they are interested in this affair more than they take the trouble to say. There was a very interesting illustration of what the commercial force of a great nation is, on that morning when the people in New York bought their newspapers from the boys announcing, “*War with Great Britain!*” In London the papers announced, “*War with America! War with America!*” A sort of dumb surprise came, but hardly for more than a few hours. Then the merchants of London arose and said, “*There shall be no war!*” And the merchants of America said, “*There shall be no war.*” And there was no war! The commercial instinct is the instinct of peace, because the commercial instinct is the instinct of civilization, and civilization means peace, and peace means civilization.

We already hear in England the echo of the voice of the business men of England, and we are going to hear in America the echo of the voice of the business men of America. The lawyers of America are on record that, as God lives, there shall be some way which shall state, as the Czar has said, “those principles of equity and right on which rest the security of states and the welfare of peoples.” And the people of America, whose duty it is to speak first, because they are the great object lesson of the world, will insist upon it that the government which they have intrusted with the duty of administration shall speak, as it is only too glad to speak, in the voice which declares, “WE WILL HAVE A PERMANENT TRIBUNAL FOR THE TWENTIETH CENTURY!”

The Coming Day of Peace.

BY REV. CHARLES G. AMES, D.D.

Address at the Unitarian Club, Boston, March 8, 1899.

A year and a half ago, some of us were pleasing ourselves with the notion that in any movement for Universal Peace the United States would march at the head of the procession. We knew that the policy of the republic was against keeping up any more than a nominal standing army; and against intervention in the affairs of other nations. We knew also that our Department of State had initiated correspondence with European governments and had found them inclined to consider favorably the proposal for treaties of arbitration. And when Mr. Olney's treaty with Great Britain failed in the Senate only for lack of a two-thirds vote, the defeat affected us like a memory of Bunker Hill. But last August we were surprised to find our country superseded in the post of honor by the head of a despotic government whose word can set in motion any day a million of soldiers.

The rescript of the Czar opens upon us with these words: “The maintenance of general peace and the possible reduction of excessive armaments. . . present themselves as ideals toward which the endeavors of all governments should be directed.” I am persuaded that the events of the last twelve months, and the history we have had a part in making, do but give a solemn emphasis to the Czar's appeal.

What people on earth can have more weighty motives than we to desire and promote the pacification of the world? If the combinations of human rapacity and violence which have wrought such havoc through the sad past are to continue their rage unchecked through the long future, our own country is to be exposed to new and formidable dangers. Every year the oceans are growing narrower; we are already nervous because our thousands of miles of coast are unfortified; and every extension of territory, as well as every advance in the development of our internal resources, will offer an inviting point of attack and compel large provisions for defence.

Are we to confirm and strengthen our free institutions and to hold a place of honor among the forces of civilization? Then we need to escape from the necessity of matching our army and navy against the ever-growing armaments of other nations. If we do not join them in following after the things that make for peace, how can we reasonably hope that the republic will not plunge at last into the abyss which has swallowed all the old empires which trusted to the sword only to perish by the sword?

To keep our own government simple, to hold back the tendencies to centralization and arbitrary power, and to spare the people from those burdens which, as the Czar truly says, are crushing Europe—all these things are involved in our coöperation with his plan.

Last summer it came to the knowledge of the British government that Russia was to add a few vessels to her navy. Parliament immediately voted to build a larger number. At about the same time, the German statesman, von Bülow, was saying, “Our future is based on our right, and our right upon the sharpness of our sword.” Very fine and brave; and in the next breath comes a request for twenty or thirty more regiments!

Meanwhile, just across the Niemen, Russia was suspicious about Emperor William's visit to the Turk; and just across the Rhine France was in a paroxysm and the republic was shaking to its base, because millions of people were more concerned for the “honor” of the army than for the honest administration of justice. At home we were being urged to fall into line with the exhausting Old World policy, and enter on a course of endless military and naval expansion.

These incidents illustrate the whole business. The nations that think it necessary to be always on a war footing, to go armed for every possible emergency, must not only lie awake nights to watch each other; they must study how to be more than a match for any other power, or any probable combination of powers. Hence the hypocritical alliances by which one group of nations is kept in hostile array against another group. Hypocritical, because not rooted in friendship. The alliances are broken off in a day at the dictate of selfishness. France is the ally of England long enough to fight out the Crimean war with Russia; France becomes the ally of